

REMARKS

The final Office Action of January 26, 2006, has been carefully analyzed. Claims 1-47 are pending in the application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-24 and 34-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipton (US 5835098) in view of Hohensee et al (US 5813020). On page 11 of the Office Action, claims 25-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipton (US 5835098) in view of Hohensee et al (US 5813020) and in further view of Hohensee et al (US 5727220).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach, disclose or suggest the elements of the Applicants' invention recited in independent claims 1, 11, 18, 25, 34 and 41.

As recited in amended claim 1, Applicants invention includes a mixed object document structure. The mixed object document structure includes a mapping structure and a page layout structure. The mapping structure includes at least one mapping reference identifying-a set of rendering control data as a secondary resource and the page layout structure includes an include object structure. The include object structure signals inclusion of an object identifying rendering control data mapped in the mapping structure for use in rendering the object. Independent claim 11, 18, 25, 34 and 41 include similar elements.

In contrast Lipton describes a process for managing color profiles. However, Lipton fails to teach, disclose or suggest a mixed object document structure. Lipton merely suggests including color objects in a data stream. Lipton does not suggest the inclusion of other types of objects.

Still further, Lipton fails to suggest a page layout structure that includes an include object structure, which signals inclusion of an object identifying rendering control data that is mapped in the mapping structure. Lipton merely includes an identifier linked to a profile in a profile folder on the system. However, as recited in claim 1, for example, Applicants' include object structure and mapping structure work together to provide a method wherein profiles for objects may be made portable. By tying a profile to each object, mapping the profile in a mapping structure and independently signaling inclusion of the object mapped in the mapping structure, the object may be moved to a different document or system thereby making the object itself portable rather than just the document.

In contrast, Lipton teaches away from Applicants' invention by teaching that a profile is defined when an object is created and storing the profile on the system. According to Lipton, a profile must be embedded in the document if the document is going to be rendered on other systems. Therefore, Lipton requires that either a color profile manager be able to find a color profile in the system folder or the color profile be embedding in the document. As indicated in Fig. 4, Lipton requires that the color profile be created by the client or embedding in the document.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 11, 18, 25, 34 and 41 are patentable over Lipton.

Hohensee '020 fail to overcome the deficiencies of Lipton. Hohensee '020 merely suggest the use of an include object structure for specifying how an object is oriented. According to Hohensee '020 the include object structure contains object mapping. However, Hohensee '020 fails to suggest a page layout structure that includes an include

object structure, which signals inclusion of an object identifying rendering control data that is mapped in the mapping structure. Hohensee '020 does not even hint at tying a profile to each object, mapping the profile in a mapping structure and independently signaling inclusion of the object mapped in the mapping structure.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 11, 18, 25, 34 and 41 are patentable over Lipton and Hohensee '020.

Hohensee '220 et al fail to overcome the deficiencies of Lipton and Hohensee '220. The Office Action cites Hohensee '220 as teaching a print server and a control unit. However, Hohensee '220 fails to disclose, teach or suggest a page layout structure that includes an include object structure, which signals inclusion of an object identifying rendering control data that is mapped in the mapping structure. Hohensee '220 does not mention using a mapping structure to enable profiles for objects to be portable.

Accordingly, Lipton, Hohensee '020 and Hohensee '220, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the invention as recited in the claims.

Dependent claims 2-10, 12-17, 19-24, 26-33, 35-40 and 42-47 are also patentable over the references, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims 1, 11, 18, 25, 34 and 41. Further dependent claims 2-10, 12-17, 19-24, 26-33, 35-40 and 42-47 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicants reserve the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-10, 12-17, 19-24, 26-33, 35-40 and 42-47 are patentable over the cited references, and request that the objections to the independent claims be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/507,022
BLD990044US1/IBMN.005-0520
Amdt. Dated March 27, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2006

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 423-757-0264.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, TN 37402
423-757-0264

By: 
Name: David W. Lynch
Reg. No.: 36,204